

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 7 and 9 – 14 are pending in the application. Claims 1 to 6, 11 and 12 have been withdrawn from consideration in response to a restriction requirement.

As noted in the Office Action, Applicants elected by telephone on March 25, 2008, to prosecute the invention of group II, claims 7, 9, 10, 13 and 14. Accordingly, claims 1 to 6, 11 and 12 are withdrawn from further consideration as drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicants acknowledge the indication of allowability of claims 7, 9 and 13 in the Office Action.

Claim 10 is objected to because “art drop” should be ---dart drop---. This has been corrected by the Amendment. Also, the word “a” has been added before dart drop, to be consistent with claim 9. Support can be found in the original disclosure at page 11, line 12.


Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph as indefinite as having insufficient antecedent basis for “said bimodal.” This has been corrected by the Amendment. Support can be found in the original disclosure at page 18, lines 17 and 26. Also, the phrase “in the range” has been moved after MFR₂ for clarity.

Although no rejection was made to claim 13, claim 13 has been amended also to clarify antecedent basis. Support can be found in the original disclosure at page 18, lines 18 – 19.

In view of the Amendment, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections and objections, and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 7, 9, 10, 13 and 14.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/3/08



Paul D. Greeley
Registration No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, LLP
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: (203) 327-4500
Fax: (203) 327-6401